



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,314	08/30/2005	Manfred Leitgeb	449122079100	1475
29177 7590 11/01/2007 BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P.O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690			EXAMINER FARAGALLA, MICHAEL A	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/521,314	LEITGEB ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Faragalla	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kari et al (Patent number: 6,636,491)** in view of Bouret et al (**publication number: 2002/0101879**).

Consider **Claim 1**, Kari et al clearly show and disclose a method for accessing network-internal functions (column 5, lines 23-32) of telecommunication networks, from an external site, with access taking place via a secure service interface device of a first network based on a service level agreement valid for the secure service interface device in favor of the external site (figure 1; column 1, lines 16-24, lines 43-45) comprising:

(a) Verifying on the part of the secure service interface device whether there is an involvement with using of a function of a second network; and exchanging a second request relating to the functions of the second network between the secure service interface device of the first network and a secure service interface device of the second network based on a service level agreement executed between the secure service interface device of the second network and the secure service interface device of the first network (abstract, figure 1; column 5, lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2); (according to Kari et al, when the mobile station is roaming in the area of the new

SGSN, the new SGSN requests MM and PDP contexts (read as second request relating to the functions of the network) from the old SGSN. Furthermore, the roaming of the mobile in the new SGSN area is considered to be a service level agreement concluded between the interface device and the secure service interface device of the target network. Moreover, the access point GGSN accepts service requests in which the rights of the user are already assured by subscription, without any security problems, which makes the SGSN secure).

However, Kari et al do not show that the verification is based on a request sent to it from the external site relating to a network-internal function. Furthermore, Kari et al do not show that the request uses a function of second network.

In related art, Bouret et al show that the verification is based on a request sent to it from the external site relating to a network-internal function (paragraph 18; paragraph 31); (according to Bouret et al, the services are being provided by an external service provider, the method comprising signaling from the external service (read as a request sent from an external site) provider to an interface entity).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bouret et al into the teaching of Kari et al in order to provide data communication services for users (Bouret et al, paragraph 4).

Consider **Claim 2**, Kari et al as modified by Bouret et al clearly show and disclose the method according to Claim 1, wherein access takes place in the context of a service,

Art Unit: 2617

which is executed by the external site for a user, the home network of which is the second network (column 1, lines 16-19; column 5, lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2).

Consider **Claim 3**, Kari et al as modified by Bouret et al clearly show and disclose the method according to Claim 1, wherein the service level agreement is generated in a manner favorable to the external site, such that a roaming agreement exists between the first and second networks set up as mobile radio networks and the service level agreement exists on a part of the access network favorable to the external site (column 1, lines 21-24; column 5, lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2).

Consider **Claim 4**, Kari et al as modified by Bouret et al clearly show and disclose the method according to Claim 1, wherein the external site is a server for external services, which are executed in the area of the access network or a visited network accessible via the first network using network-internal services for users that are connected or logged in (figure 1; column 5 lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2).

Consider **Claim 5**, Kari et al as modified by Bouret et al clearly show and disclose the method according to Claim 1, wherein messages exchanged further to the second request between the external site and the second network are transmitted via the secure service interface devices, with the secure service interface device of the second network forwarding messages exchanged between the external site and the secure

Art Unit: 2617

service interface device of the second network in a transparent manner (figure 1; column 5 lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2); (according to Kari et al, when the mobile station is roaming in the area of the new SGSN, the new SGSN requests MM and PDP contexts (read as second request relating to the functions of the network) from the old SGSN. Therefore, there has to be messages exchanged between the two SGSNs in order for the new SGSN to request MM and PDP contexts from the old SGSN. Furthermore, those messages would be a result of the communication between the external site and the SGSN through the GPRS backbone. In addition, the user would not know of these messages because they are between nodes of the network (SGSN's) which is being interpreted as transparent manner of forwarding messages).

Consider **Claim 6**, Kari et al as modified by Bouret al clearly show and disclose the method according to Claim 1, wherein messages exchanged further to the second request between the external site and network centers of the second network are transmitted via the secure service interface device of the second network, with the secure service interface device forwarding the messages as a transparent proxy server (figure 1; column 4, lines 42-50; column 5 lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2); (according to Kari et al, the SGSN is connected to the HLR a Gr interface. Therefore, when the second SGSN requests MM and PDP contexts from the second SGSN, the data can be retrieved from the HLR of the second network because the SGSN of the second network and the HLR are linked).

Consider **Claim 7**, Kari et al clearly show and disclose a network device of a first network, which is set up as a secure service interface device (read as SGSN) (figure 1; abstract) to Verify on the part of the interface device whether there is an involvement with using of a function of a second network; and exchanging a second request relating to the functions of the another network between the secure service interface devices of the first and second networks based on a service level agreement executed between the respective secure service interface devices. (abstract, figure 1; column 5, lines 57-67; column 6, lines 1 and 2); (according to Kari et al, when the mobile station is roaming in the area of the new SGSN, the new SGSN requests MM and PDP contexts (read as second request relating to the functions of the network) from the old SGSN. Furthermore, the roaming of the mobile in the new SGSN area is considered to be a service level agreement concluded between the interface device and the secure service interface device of the target network. Moreover, the access point GGSN accepts service requests in which the rights of the user are already assured by subscription, without any security problems, which makes the SGSN secure).

However, Kari et al do not show that the verification is based on a request sent to it from the external site relating to a network-internal function. Furthermore, Kari et al do not show that the request uses a function of another network.

In related art, Bouret et al show that the verification is based on a request sent to it from the external site relating to a network-internal function (paragraph 18; paragraph 31); (according to Bouret et al, the services are being provided by an external service

Art Unit: 2617

provider, the method comprising signaling from the external service (read as a request sent from an external site) provider to an interface entity).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bouret et al into the teaching of Kari et al in order to provide data communication services for users (Bouret et al, paragraph 4).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Faragalla whose telephone number is (571) 270-1107. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Faragalla

10/29/2007


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER